

REMARKS

Counsel for Applicants thanks Examiner Cole for the helpful suggestions within the Office Action mailed February 19, 2003 for revising the specification, figures, and claims. Submitted herewith are revised drawings, which include a new Figure 7 and 8 that explicitly show features described in the original specification and claims. The amendments to the specification merely make more explicit or use alternative language for matter already disclosed in the original specification and claims. Hence, no new matter has been added. Approval of the drawing amendments is respectfully requested so that formal drawings may be submitted.

The PTO-892 mailed with the Office Action of February 19, 2003 does not list the art acknowledged as received in the Notification of Acceptance of Application Under 35 U.S.C. 371, including that cited in the International Search Report. A form PTO-1449 is submitted herewith listing the art previously submitted to the Patent Office for consideration. A copy of this form with the Examiner's indication that the art has been fully considered is respectfully requested.

CLAIM STATUS

Claims 24-50 are pending. Claims 24-46 correspond to prior claims 1-23 respectively, which are re-presented in amended form to facilitate their review. The re-presented claims have been redrafted to more definitely and positively recite applicants' invention. Claims 47-50 are newly presented.

THE PENDING CLAIMS ARE PATENTABLE OVER THE PRIOR ART

U.S. PATENT 2,552,339, TO MOON ("Moon"). The claimed inventions are readily distinguished from Moon's "fluid propelled" device as Moon's device has no means for propelling itself along a surface by moving one body with respect to another. With reference to column 2, lines 1-3, of Moon, discs 1 and 26 are used to propel Moon's device only when fluid pressure in a pipe is applied against them. Moon's device has no means for self propulsion. In contrast, the present invention provides a vehicle that moves in response to the movement of two bodies towards and away from each other wherein bristles on the respective bodies engage a surface to provide traction and urge the device to move. Further, the device of Moon does not use fluid pressure (i.e., pneumatic or hydraulic pressure) to move his brushes toward and away from the central shafts to which they are mounted, rather Moon's saddles 11 are mounted on hinges and are urged outwardly by a spring; this results in a very limited range of motion. Moon's device has different components which interact in a different way from those of the present invention, and Moon's device does not perform all of the recited functions of the claimed inventions.

U.S. PATENT 1,608,347, TO THOMPSON ET AL. ("Thompson"). Thompson suffers deficiencies similar to Moon. For example, Thompson does not teach a device capable of self-propelling action, but rather teaches at column 1, lines 87-93, that the device is provided with a plunger against which water pressure may be applied to propel the device through a pipe.

Thompson and Moon do not teach a device that can move itself against the flow of fluid in a pipe or that can change its direction of travel, do not teach the recited traction propulsion mechanism, and do not teach fluid pressure means to move a bristle holding member with respect to a body in moving device.


U.S. PATENT 2,932,837 ("Ver Nooy"), U.S. PATENT 4,447,777 ("Sharp"), U.S. PATENT 3,310,113 ("Maness"), U.S. PATENT 5,018,451 ("Hapstack"), and U.S. PATENT 3,525,111 ("Von Arx").

In the outstanding Office Action, Ver Nooy, Sharp, Maness, Hapstack and Von Arx were cited in various combinations with Moon or Thompson against various dependent claims. It is respectfully submitted that none of these combinations fulfill all of the deficiencies between the claimed inventions and the teachings of Moon and Thompson discussed above. Further, only Hapstack was invented within a decade of the present inventions. In contrast to the prior art, *inter alia*, the claimed vehicle of the present invention can traverse empty pipelines or traverse pipelines in a direction opposite to the direction of flowing fluid, and can also traverse considerably more irregular surfaces than can be traversed by prior art vehicles. In view of the substantial benefits of the present invention and that the other references are several decades old one of skill in the art would not find such it obvious to combine their teachings as suggested in the Office Action, and such a combination still does not result in the claimed invention.

It is respectfully submitted that claims 24-50 are in condition for allowance, and allowance is respectfully requested. To expedite prosecution, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned should the Examiner have any questions.

Respectfully submitted,

July 8, 2003
Date


Daniel B. Schein, Ph.D., Esq.
Registration No. 33,551
Attorney for Applicants

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. Box 10395
Chicago, IL 60610

Telephone: (408) 971-0627
Facsimile: (408) 971-0941